

12

second access hole and wherein the first end of the flexible member passes through the first access hole of the container;  
means for rotating the spool within the container; and  
means for retaining the spool vertically and concentrically within the container [free from attachment to] freely resting within the container so that the spool may be removed from the container as one piece.

---

#### REMARKS

This is in response to the Decision on Appeal mailed on July 16, 1998. Claims 1, 3-11, 16-19, 22-37 were pending of which claims 3-11, 23, 25, 27-32 and 35 were withdrawn from consideration. The Decision on Appeal reversed the rejection of claims 1, 16-19, 22, 24, 26, 33, 34, 36 and 37, but entered a new rejection of claims 1, 16 and 17. Claims 1, 16 and 17 are amended. All claims are in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and notice to that effect is respectively requested.

Claims 1, 16 and 17 were rejected because they required a spool which was "free from attachment to the container" and either a foot plate "including mounting holes" (for claims 1 and 16) or a "means for retaining the spool" (for claim 17). The Decision on Appeal stated, "In the embodiment of Figs. 5 and 6 the spool is 'attached' to the container by retainer 137." Thus, the Board considered the embodiment of Figs. 5 and 6 not to meet the limitation of the spool being "free from attachment to the container", and rejected claims 1, 16 and 17 as being based on an inadequate description.

Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to omit the limitation that the spool is "free from attachment to the container". Both of these claims continue to require the bottom of the spool to be "freely resting" upon the base of the container (for claim 1) or within the container (for claim 17), and thus remain allowable over the prior art of record for the reasons stated in the Decision on Appeal, among others. The rejection of claims 1, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph is overcome and should be withdrawn.

31

Claims 3-6, 23, 25, 27-32 and 35, previously withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being directed to a non-elected species, are written in dependent form from an allowable base claim. Examination and allowance of claims 3-6, 23, 25, 27-32 and 35 is respectively requested. Pursuant to the provisions MPEP §821.02, claims 7-11 may be canceled by an Examiner's amendment when the remainder of the case is allowed.

Pending claims 1, 3-6, 16-19 and 22-37 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and notice to that effect is respectively requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

By: 

Jeffrey D. Shewchuk, Reg. No. 37,235  
Suite 1500

625 Fourth Avenue South

Minneapolis, MN 55415-1659

Phone: (612) 339-1863 Fax: (612) 339-6580

JDS:alg